



600 Third Avenue, 22nd Floor | New York, NY 10016-1915 | [bsk.com](http://bsk.com)

**JAMES E. MCGRATH, III**  
[jmcgrath@bsk.com](mailto:jmcgrath@bsk.com)  
P: 646.253.2319

March 28, 2022

**VIA ECF**

Hon. Steven I. Locke  
United States Magistrate Judge  
Eastern District of New York

Re: Raul Siancas, *et al.* v. Rallye Motors, *et al.*,  
E.D.N.Y., 14-CV-6151 (JS)(SIL)

Dear Judge Locke:

I represent the Rallye Defendants in the above-referenced matter. I write, not to reply to the substance of Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of their Motion to File an Amended Complaint, as such would be an improper sur-reply. I write instead only to point out that Plaintiffs' Reply papers are themselves untimely. Plaintiffs served this motion on March 1, 2022 and Rallye duly responded with its opposition on March 14<sup>th</sup>. Pursuant to Local Rule 6.1(b), Plaintiffs' Reply papers were due to be served and filed on March 21<sup>st</sup>. In addition, pursuant to Your Honor's Bundle Rule, all papers on the motion were to be filed by Plaintiffs as the moving party on March 21<sup>st</sup>. Plaintiffs did not serve a timely reply and did not file the bundled motion papers.

On Friday, March 25<sup>th</sup>, in light of Plaintiffs' failure, I asked that Plaintiffs immediately file their motion papers and my opposition. A copy of my letter from earlier today is attached. Rather than doing so, and rather than even acknowledging my letter or the lateness of their reply papers, Plaintiffs filed the bundled motion, including their tardy reply.

I respectfully request that the Plaintiffs' Reply papers be rejected as untimely.

Very truly yours,

BOND, SCHOENECK & KING, PLLC

*James E. McGrath, III*

James E. McGrath, III

cc: Steven J. Moser, Esq. via email and via ECF